

LA06-171

BYRON L. DORGAN
NORTH DAKOTA
323 MARY SENATE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3405
202-224-3551
202-224-8578 TDD

COMMITTEES:
APPROPRIATIONS
COMMERCE, SCIENCE & TRANSPORTATION
ENERGY & NATURAL RESOURCES
INDIAN AFFAIRS

CHAIRMAN, DEMOCRATIC POLICY COMMITTEE

United States Senate

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-3405

April 10, 2006

STATE OFFICES:


512 FEDERAL BUILDING
THIRD AND ROSSER AVENUE
P.O. BOX 2579
BISMARCK, ND 58502
701-250-4518
1-800-855-4182 TOLL-FREE

1802 28TH AVENUE S., SUITE 8
P.O. BOX 8060
FARGO, ND 58108
701-230-8380

102 NORTH 4TH STREET, ROOM 108
GRAND FORKS, ND 58201
701-748-8572

180 1ST STREET, S.W., ROOM 105
MINOT, ND 58701
701-852-8703

Mr. Martin Gruenberg
Acting Chairman
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation
550 17th Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20429



Dear Chairman Gruenberg:

I am writing to urge the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) to reject Wal-Mart's application for federal deposit insurance for an industrial loan company (ILC) that Wal-Mart has chartered under Utah's permissive state banking law. Allowing Wal-Mart to own and operate a federally-insured bank violates one of the most important tenets in federal banking law: banks and commercial businesses should be kept separate.

It has been longstanding federal policy generally to prohibit the mixing of banking and commerce - the unitary thrift holding company exception to that policy was repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act in 1999 for just that reason. Keeping banking and the workings of the nation's payment and credit system separate from the nation's industrial and retail sectors helps to ensure the stability and integrity of the banking system and reduces the chance of a major banking failure and taxpayer bailout.

Federal law continues to contain an exception to the general pattern of banking regulation for ILCs, which were originally conceived of as small loan companies catering to less affluent individuals. Unfortunately, a number of large financial services and commercial firms are using the ILC exception as a loophole to obtain approval for large-scale banking activities that were never intended by Congress to exist - if at all - in the manner permitted for ILCs. The owners of ILCs, even if they could own banks, would be subject to the Bank Holding Company Act were it not for the ILC loophole. Equally, if not more importantly, non-financial services firms such as Wal-Mart would never be permitted to engage in banking activities under the Bank Holding Company Act.

If Wal-Mart is granted deposit insurance, one of the nation's largest and most powerful corporations would be permitted to enter the banking business through this unintended back door. A downturn, let alone a failure, in Wal-Mart's colossal retail business could create a major disruption in the nation's banking system. Moreover, Wal-Mart's market power is almost incapable of challenge. A Wal-Mart bank could potentially make decisions to grant or withhold credit that could have an adverse impact on many local economies, especially in the rural areas of our nation.

Page Two
April 10, 2006

In conclusion, I want to join other policymakers, consumer and workers' interest groups, and federal bank regulators who have raised a concern about the ILC loophole. Ultimately, this loophole should be closed. But the first step is for the FDIC to say a resounding "no" to Wal-Mart and reject the application of Wal-Mart's ILC for federal deposit insurance.

Thank you in advance for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you soon on this critically important issue.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Byron', written over the word 'Sincerely,'.

Byron L. Dorgan
U.S. Senator

BLD:ach